<center>REMARKS</center>

Claims 19-40 were pending and stand rejected. None of the claims has been amended.

The specification was objected to because the abstract exceeded 150 words. The abstract has been amended and no longer exceeds 150 words. No new matter has been added by this amendment.

Claims 19-20, 22-31, and 33-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Heisele. Applicant respectfully traverses. Claim 19, which has not been amended, recites:

A method for recognizing faces of persons, comprising:
      training a system to recognize a facial component;
      populating a first knowledge base with facial components and, for each facial component, the facial component's body part classification;
      using the first knowledge base to determine, for each facial component in a plurality of facial components, a body part classification for the facial component, wherein the plurality of facial components comprises facial components extracted from facial identification training image data of a face of a first person at a first viewpoint and a face of a second person at a second viewpoint;
      determining, from said plurality of facial components and their determined body part classifications, a first indicator component for the first person and a second indicator component for the second person, wherein the first indicator component comprises a first facial component that maximizes a posterior probability that the person class of the first facial component is the first person, and wherein the second indicator component comprises a second facial component that maximizes a posterior probability that the person class of the second facial component is the second person.

On April 4, 2008, the Examiner, the Examiner's supervisor, and the undersigned attorney had a telephone interview during which they discussed claim 19 and Heisele. The attorney argued that the 102(b) rejection based on Heisele was improper because Heisele does not disclose all of the elements of claim 19. The Examiner agreed and stated that the next office action would be non-final.

Therefore, claim 19 is patentable over Heisele. Independent claim 30 recites similar language and is also patentable over Heisele for at least the same reasons.

Claims 21 and 32 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heisele in view of Viola. Applicant respectfully traverses. The claims not specifically mentioned above depend from claims 19 or 30 (directly or indirectly), which were shown to be patentable over Heisele. In addition, these claims recite other features not included in claims 19 or 30. Thus, these claims are patentable over Heisele, for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the elements that they individually recite. For the record, Applicant traverses the Examiner's assertions regarding the disclosure of Viola and regarding the motivation to combine Heisele and Viola.

Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are now allowable over the cited art of record and requests that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,
TAKAMASA KOSHIZEN, ET AL.

Dated: April 14, 2008   By: /Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale/
                                         Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale, Reg. No. 55,687
                                         Attorney for Applicant
                                         FENWICK & WEST LLP
                                         Silicon Valley Center
                                         801 California Street
                                         Mountain View, CA 94041
                                         Tel.: (650) 335-7187
                                         Fax: (650) 938-5200